

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment and reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

The present office action does not specifically address reasons for the rejection of claim 8. If the examiner maintains the rejection of claim 8, then the next office action should specifically explain the reasons for the rejection and should not be final.

In claim 1, "only one" has been changed to --the same-- to broaden the claim. The phrase "and wherein the PCB is contained within the housing" has been added to distinguish from US5038240.

In claim 3, the phrase "the optical disk drive includes a heat conducting mounting means in addition to the PCB" to indicate that the PCB is in addition to the heat conducting means to distinguish from US5038240.

Claim 4 has been amended so that the wire flex is "bent about the bending axis"

The claims were not otherwise amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicant respectfully reserves all rights he/she may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form so that the PCB in claim 4 does not have to be "contained within the housing".

In response to the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly obvious over US 2003/0016597 to Haruguchi in view of US5038240 to Isomura, the combination of citations does not suggest the invention of the amended claims.

More specifically, With regard to claim 1, the combination does not suggest that the same PCB to which optical pick-up unit, the guide, and the drive motor are attached "is contained within the housing" as in amended claim 1. The advantage of the PCB being

contained in the housing is that the housing shields the back of the PCB.

With regard to claim 2, the combination does not suggest "electronic components on a side thereof facing an adjacent housing wall" as in claim 2. Figure 8 of Isomura does not suggest "electronic components on a side thereof facing an adjacent housing wall" as in claim 2.

With regard to claim 3, the combination does not suggest "a heat conducting mounting means in addition to the PCB" as in amended claim 3.

With regard to claim 4, the combination of citations does not suggest "a wire flex which is bent bendable about one bending axis only, said bending axis being substantially parallel to the shaft" as in claim 4.

With regard to claim 8, the present office action does not specifically address reasons for the rejection of claim 8. However, the applicant makes the following assertion regarding the patentability of claim 8 in view of the combination. The combination of citations does not suggest "first the main electrical components are mounted on one side of the PCB, and then the guide, the pick-up unit, and the drive motor are mounted on the opposite side of the PCB" as in claim 8.

With regard to claim 9, the combination does not suggest "first the main electrical components (18) are mounted on one side of the PCB (17), and then the guide (9), the pick-up unit (5), and the drive motor (2) are mounted on the opposite side of the PCB" as in claim 9. In Isomura the main electrical components are mounted on the same side of the circuit board as the guide, pick-up unit, and drive motor. The claim requires that they be mounted on the opposite side.

There is no suggestion in either citation to combine the citations.

The claims are definite and distinguished from the citations and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9643